

Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program  
Technical Advisory Council

Southern California Association of Governments  
12th Floor Board Room  
818 West 7th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
10:00am – 4:00pm

1. Welcome – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

2. Roll Call – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

Roll call: Mike Antos, Kit Batten, Louise Bedsworth, Louis Blumberg, Keali'i Bright, Tina Curry, Jana Ganion, Grieg Asher, Sona Mohnot, Andrea Ouse, Jonathan Parfrey, Tapan Pathak, Bruce Riordan, Brian Strong.

Not present: Ashley Conrad-Saydah, Danielle Bergstrom, Michael Carroll, Maureen Frank, Martin Gonzalez, Cara Martinson, Gloria Walton, Kate White

3. Approval of draft minutes (6/16/17 meeting) – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

Louis Blumberg motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Mike Antos seconded.  
All: Aye

4. Adaptation Financing Framework and Case Studies – Nuin-Tara Key, OPR

Nuin-Tara Key gave an overview and background of the Council and staff's work on financing thus far:

With direction from the Financing Workgroup, ICARP staff are working to develop an Adaptation Financing Framework that will be hosted on the ICARP Adaptation Clearinghouse. The framework will highlight potential financing mechanisms that can be used to support adaptation planning and implementation efforts. In addition, the framework will include:

- Project-specific criteria or factors that should be considered when evaluating the utility of a specific financing mechanism
- Case studies that highlight how different mechanism have been used to support adaptation and resiliency efforts
- Identification of current funding and financing gaps or challenges

To support this effort, staff have begun preliminary research and are partnering with other organizations that are pursuing similar efforts. Partners include Resources Legacy Fund (RLF), San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank (SF FRB), San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's (BCDC), and the California Fourth Climate Change Assessment project team "Overcoming Financial and Institutional Barriers to Local Adaptation". Details of these partnerships and a timeline for further involvement can be found in the [staff report](#) for this agenda item.

## COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Nuin-Tara Key asked for Council members who participated in the first SF FRB convening to share their thoughts on how the meeting went.

Louise Bedsworth: There were many suggestions at the meeting for the TAC to engage. It was clear that being able to talk through the financing with concrete project examples would be helpful to inform our framework. It enables us to link characteristics of projects to financing approaches more clearly. I also think the partnership with SF FRB is great, as they have a focus on advancing disadvantaged communities and have a lot of experience networking with communities.

Jonathan Parfrey: I agree with Louise. The more specific we can get identifying where the funding resources are and how they can be applied the better. The specifics and deal making of financial institutions is opaque to most people working in the resilience arena. A more detailed understanding of these processes will allow for better and easier decision-making.

On a related note, the greenhouse gas reduction fund (GGRF) budget vote is today ([AB 109](#)). It would be helpful for us to examine where the money will be going and where it might fall shy in terms of planning needs.

Nuin-Tara Key: Thank you for the feedback, this is in alignment with the purpose for the FRB convenings, which is twofold. One is to get a better understanding of the funding and financing mechanisms out there. An equally important purpose of the meetings is to ensure that the social and economic values we are looking to implement are squarely centered in our funding and financing goals. We want to make sure we are investing in the most vulnerable and frontline communities.

Mike Antos: Some banking institutions currently have mandates to invest in vulnerable communities. I would like to know how what we are doing aligns with those mandates and to better understand how these work.

Bruce Riordan: I get calls all the time about adaptation financing. Where should I send them?

Nuin-Tara Key: You can send them to me.

Keali'i Bright: Another area of interest is around procurement strategies that are tied to projects and how a shift of liability will occur on major projects. It is challenging to build resilience measures into contracts because of the difficulty with defining the funding needed to ensure outcomes when chasing a spectrum of climate impacts.

Nuin-Tara Key: We haven't been looking at this specifically, but I think BCDC might be looking at this in their workgroup meetings. I will bring up in a future meeting.

Louis Blumberg: I would like to reinforce Jonathan's point about discussing the AB 398 funding category. Some of this funding may go to adaptation and resilience. This may raise insights into what criteria we should be looking to fill in in the framework.

Louise Bedsworth: We aren't ready to give a comprehensive update on the bill at the moment. I do know there are a number of bills that may have adaptation funding. We can return to this at

the December meeting when we are closer to the implementation of the budget package. I agree that we should keep this in mind.

Louis Blumberg: This would be useful for the NGOs and local governments that serve on the TAC.

Brian Strong: Could the Department of Finance come give a review of financial tools and an update on legislation? Also, is there talk of tax credits at the SF FRB meetings?

NTK: We can bring the subject of tax credits to the SF FRB meetings.

Louise Bedsworth: We will work to find the right person to come and speak on the matter.

***Investigating Financing Options for Supporting Climate Adaptation in California***  
*Resources Legacy Fund, Matt Armsby*

Matt Armsby presented to the Council on the adaptation financing research project that Resources Legacy Fund (RLF) is carrying out. The goal of the presentation was to give the Council background knowledge of the initial thinking and project scoping of RLF's work to come and to ensure that RLF and the Council are coordinating work products. A detailed presentation outlining the anticipated approach and outputs, potential research priorities, and discussion questions can be found [here](#).

**COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

Mike Antos: Perhaps one goal could be to analyze where large investments are that we should stop doing to stop maladaptive actions. What is the difference between what we spend today on something and how we should be spending it in the future (shifting from maladaptive to adaptive actions). For example, Climate Resolve in Los Angeles is supporting cool roofs and cool paving projects.

Matt Armsby: Yes, existing funding streams could be investing more.

Louis Blumberg: Leveraging and studying existing funding sources is very important. Evaluate the effectiveness of grants and identify policy barriers to determine necessary policy change.

Jonathan Parfrey: I echo Louis and Mike's comments. It would be helpful to have an analysis of programs to see if they are addressing specific issues (ex: roads, open space) and identify where extra funding is needed where an entire new program would be best.

Bruce Riordan: How are you going to deal with issue of scale here?

Matt Armsby: We are studying specific projects. The intent is to lay out a suite of options with case studies and ask: if we were to expand at regional or state level what are the funding needs? We are also trying to avoid coming up with one big number or cost estimate for the entire state. With that comes a lot of built in assumptions and politics, and it is usually a conversation stopper.

Nuin-Tara Key: In term of scale, we are also looking at how we quantify a benefit or value that accrues to a community "downstream" from where the direct investments are made (social benefits).

Bruce Riordan: We should focus on wildfire. The costs of fighting fires is something that is right in front of Californians.

Brian Strong: Study risk analysis and give examples of how capacity building could be built into the different study areas.

Sona Mohnot: I would like to see highlighted whether projects have done community engagement, along with an analysis of what worked, what did not, and how we can improve those projects.

Keali'i Bright: You should talk with grant managers who work on programs. They have a detailed understanding of local capacity.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

### **5. Senate Bill 1: Adaptation Planning Grant Update – Nuin-Tara Key, OPR**

In place of Kate White, Nuin-Tara Key gave an update on the [Senate Bill 1 Adaptation Planning Grant](#), including the final grant guide, which includes a coordination role for ICARP. The final grant guides were released on Thursday, 9/14. The [presentation slides](#) provided for the meeting go over the TAC input at the June 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, an overview of the guidelines, and SB1 & ICARP Collaboration.

#### **COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

Louis Blumberg: I think the tie in with the TAC is great. On partnership slide, it would be good to require consultants to be aware of the listed state priorities. Applicants should consult them about these. I noticed the elimination of green infrastructure from eligible projects. Also, why do RTPAs have a later deadline?

NTK: Green infrastructure is still listed as an example but not in the project list. I'm not sure why it was removed. I also don't know the reason for the different timeline.

Kit Batten: When will the Council be engaged in these grants?

NTK: We haven't worked out the timeline with CalTrans yet. We will get back to you with details.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

### **6. Hazard Mitigation Grant Program – Tina Curry and Jenn Hogan, OES**

Jennifer Hogan presented to the Council on the [2017 Winter Storms Hazard Mitigation Grant Program](#). A brief summary of the program can be found in the [presentation slides](#). Some notable additions to the presentation slides are below.

- The State of California has an enhanced statewide plan, which means it gets a larger percentage of federal hazard mitigation dollars than other states that do not have their own enhanced plan. This year, the extra 5% translates to an extra \$30M.
- 51 of 58 counties declared disasters in 2017, but all counties can apply.
- Proposed savings from funded projects must be greater than the cost of the project.
- There is currently \$115M available in HMGP funding, but this number will likely go up. 495 notices of interest came in for funding and 350 met eligibility requirements. Additional points are given for climate resilience mitigation actions and to applicants who have not previously accessed the funds.

## COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Kit Batten: To clarify is CalOES the intermediary between applicants and FEMA? Where do jurisdictions get the money to do projects when they aren't funded through this program?

Tina Curry: Yes, we serve as an intermediary. CalOES does have some reserved funds for very dire needs but some of the projects remain in need of funding. Some projects have a higher priority as they have applied before. Some have higher needs too.

Louis Blumberg: Are these project applications linking with other efforts? Are Local Coastal Program (LCP) updates eligible? Can those activities be eligible?

Jenn Hogan: LCP updates are eligible as long as they are tied to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) if they have one.

Jonathan Parfrey: It sounds like the program scoring may lack equity considerations if past applicants get higher priority.

Bruce Riordan: How often does FEMA deny applications after your scoring processes?

Jenn Hogan: Not entirely sure of the number, but during the last disaster, 30 out of 36 submitted were funded.

Tina Curry: There is also pre-disaster mitigation funding in which projects compete with the rest of the nation for a smaller amount of money.

Louise Bedsworth: Does the program require quantified ecosystem benefits measurement?

Tina Curry: We usually just looks at dollars and return on investment.

Jonathan Parfrey: Has there been an analysis of how disasters in other parts of the country may affect funding in California over the next few years?

Tina Curry: FEMA has been looking at the cost of disasters and the unsustainable nature of current funding amounts.

Keali'i Bright: At the national level, are other states moving towards similar steps that we are taking to prepare and respond to disasters?

Tina Curry: It is hard to make the comparison because we are such a big state. The test will be the latest storms.

Kit Batten: Climate Resiliency metrics seemed to be only geared towards flooding. Is that due to the disasters that triggered this funding?

Jenn Hogan: Those metrics are specified by FEMA.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

#### **7. 2017 General Plan Guidelines Update – Michael McCormick, OPR**

Michael McCormick [presented](#) to the Council on the [General Plan Guidelines](#) Update that released about a month prior. Some additional notes are below:

- SB 379: Adaptation is now required in the safety element. The guidelines provide a process to go through to do this but aren't too prescriptive because we heard through workshops that people wanted flexibility.
- Some cities might need to update twice if they have housing element or safety element. We suggest to use housing update cycle to do safety element update too.
- The list of tools and resources in safety element will largely be mirrored by adaptation clearinghouse.
- Data needs are outlined in statute. We provide resources for this via the [GPG tool](#), MyPlan and MyHazards, which mostly use data from the state [Geoportal](#).

#### **COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

Kit Batten: We submitted formal comments on the Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) about the need for collaboration. I would love to hear more about ongoing collaborative work taking place in air districts and water districts. I know air management districts were established by federal statute, so this could be a big lift, but I want to leverage [ARCCA's](#) work and other regional work being done.

Michael McCormick: We can do some research to summarize what is happening on the district scales.

Jonathan Parfrey: What has been going on in southern California is that a number of Council of Governments (COGs) have decided to create regional planning frameworks, which helps their members comply with the new guidelines. It also outlines regional risks. LA County put out an RFP for a Sustainability Plan, which will have an adaptation template for 88 cities within the county. This is a great trend – the idea of regionalism as way of getting to targets.

Michael McCormick: Under the federal stimulus, there was momentum for collaboration in GHG measures. MPOs were helping to coordinate those discussions. General Plans started to use regional strategies.

Bruce: How are the Guidelines reinforced?

Michael McCormick: We send out letters to jurisdictions who have not updated their General Plans to comply with Statute. The Guidelines are not legally enforceable. General Plan requirements are usually legally enforced by local lawsuits. OPR provides technical support.

Louis Blumberg: Do the guidelines apply to all cities and counties? Is there integration between cities and counties?

Michael McCormick: General Plan statute applies to all cities and counties. If a single board governs a city and county, statute would be addressed in one plan.

Louis Blumberg: What about Climate Action Plans? Is there opportunity for cross-referencing the two with updates, especially for those CAPs that include adaptation?

Michael McCormick: Cross-Referencing is the goal.

Louis Blumberg: How about SLR guidance? How many years out are you suggesting people plan for?

Michael McCormick: We point to the Coastal Act and the guidance provided by the California Coastal Commission.

Brian Strong: What are local government reactions on this and to the coming CEQA updates?

Michael McCormick: Locals were looking for a standard process to rely on, which this provides for them.

Mike Antos: Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (IRWM Plans) are required to update their vulnerability assessments, and we are trying to plan off General Plan guidance. It would be helpful to collate overlapping guidance.

Andrea Ouse: Will we get guidance on how “feasibility” is defined (as in “feasible approaches to reducing risk”)?

Michael McCormick: We can’t define that because it isn’t defined in statute. We are provide information on this through case studies and technical assistance.

Andrea Ouse: If a city has a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, can they use their housing element update to incorporate adaptation?

Michael McCormick: Because not all jurisdictions have an LHMP, we are suggesting to incorporate it during the next housing element update.

Jana Ganion: Tribal governments are not subject to state statute but they look to state policy to conduct their own planning efforts. I would encourage you to interact with tribal governments in their regions for vulnerability assessments.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

### **8. Adaptation Vision and Principles– Nuin-Tara Key, OPR**

Nuin-Tara Key gave an overview of the steps taken to develop the vision and principles outlined in the [staff memo](#). Through many council and workgroup meetings, a final vision and principles are now ready for adoption.

#### **COUNCIL DISCUSSION – Vision**

Louis Blumberg: The vision reads well, is contemporary, and reflects discourse of today. The bold highlighting helps as well. One proposed wordsmith would be to add “while achieving the following long-term *outcomes*” and removing the “can’s” from the beginning of each bullet.

Sona Mohnot: This incorporates many of the comments from last meeting. Is Principle Number 2 a placeholder rather than listing out vulnerable communities specifically?

Nuin-Tara Key: We went back and forth between listing out specific communities or not. We want to make sure this list maintains its relevancy, so we thought having it be general for now and then further discuss how we define vulnerability in the context of the implementation action and metrics discussion.

Sona Mohnot: The Climate Justice Working Group also struggled with defining vulnerable communities but if it would be helpful I can share our findings with the group.

Other agreed upon changes by multiple members:

- Remove second half of the third sentence, first paragraph (starting from “so”).
- Remove “across all” and “activities” in the fifth sentence, first paragraph.
- Remove “conditions” from the third (final) bullet.

#### **COUNCIL DISCUSSION – Principles**

Brian Strong: Add “and beyond” at the end of principle 5.

Mike Antos: In principle 7, last part of the sentence is repetitive. Delete “feedback loops”, change “incorporate” to “incorporates”

Bruce Riordan: Vulnerable communities should be defined more specifically.

Kit Batten: Did we define vulnerable communities in TAG document?

Louise: We have an ‘included but not limited to’ list that is very long.



Sona Mohnot: The definition used in the CJWG for vulnerable communities is as follows:

“Frontline communities that experience continuing injustice—including people of color, immigrants, people with lower incomes, those in rural areas, and indigenous people—face a legacy of systemic, largely racialized, inequity that influences their living and working places, the quality of their air and water, and their economic opportunities. Climate justice requires California leaders to acknowledge that these frontline communities are experts in creating solutions to protect and preserve our air, water, land, and communities, despite their historical exclusion from decision making and from public resources and services. Climate justice requires California leaders to provide public resources and services to frontline communities to engage and assist them in developing technologies, policies, professions, services, and projects for addressing the causes and impacts of climate change and healing from historical injustices.”

Kit Batten: That is a very broad definition of communities that does not include specific references to climate change impacts but spells out the underlying conditions that cause vulnerability. Many of those communities will be susceptible to sea level rise, wildfire, heat waves, etc.

Louise Bedsworth: I think we may be conflating adaptive capacity and vulnerability. Vulnerability equals the exposure plus underlying characteristics that speak to capacity. How do we want to address that?

Nuin-Tara Key: Propose the Council does not defining vulnerability here, but address this in the metrics/implementation part of the discussion – if we want to measure progress at reducing vulnerability through our implementation efforts, we need to define what we are measuring.

Grieg Asher: Louise, the sentence you provided was a good descriptor to add (vulnerability = exposure + adaptive capacity).

Tina: Stated similarly, vulnerable communities are those most impacted by climate change but with the fewest resources to adapt.

Kit Batten: Sona, what is the product and expectation of the CJWG?

Sona Mohnot: Resources Legacy Fund brought Greenlining and 14 other organizations together. One goal was to review the 2014 Safeguarding plan by sector and provide recommendations. Another goal was to provide guiding principles and policy recommendations for any adaptation plans. We spent a lot of time defining vulnerability, which includes historical context and underlying conditions (CJWG [Guiding Principles and Recommendations](#)).

Kit Batten: Perhaps we should decide to define vulnerable according to the CJWG effort, plus our ongoing work to define implementation metrics. I feel uncomfortable that we are the right group to try and condense into a few words what is clearly a big effort.

Louise Bedsworth: Keali'i, have you incorporated the CJWG definition into Safeguarding?

Keali'i Bright: We have been working to incorporate a lot of the comments but I am unsure about the specific definition itself.

Louise Bedsworth: Shall we move forward with adopting the vision and principles now, with a condition that we will define vulnerable communities in the context of the implementation metrics discussion?

Jana: If we are going to tackle defining vulnerable communities as part of the metrics, I support adopting the vision and principles as they are today but doing the work that Kit and Sona mentioned. The principles could be changed later, but they are just that – principles. In the metrics we need to be clearer. I don't see a reason to hold off adopting the vision and principles if we all agree on them now.

Bruce: Can we adopt this with the notes that we will define vulnerable communities in the document later?

Louise: Should we include an asterisk with a note at the bottom? Or just note this as an ongoing work stream?

Kit: We could hyperlink to additional information.

Brian Strong: I would like to see that definition before putting out a document referencing it. Can we collect this information in between now and later?

Sona Mohnot: It would be difficult to define a vulnerable community in such short space, so I agree with Kit's comment of linking out.

Louise: We can vote on the vision and principles with the changes we made. We will work on defining vulnerable communities between now and December.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Meredith Milet: I would like to add that the definition of vulnerable communities versus the metrics used to track them and their policies are different. Those might be two different parts of this.

Louise Bedsworth: That comment came up in the conversation with the SF FRB as well.

## **ACTION**

Motion: Kit Batten

Seconded: Brian Strong

All: Aye

## **COUNCIL DISCUSSION – Implementation Actions**

Nuin-Tara Key walked through the [staff memo](#) for the proposed implementation actions, including the different categories of metrics we could be tracking: a primary category focusing on government action, a secondary category focusing on vulnerable communities, and a third category on impacts. Discussion questions were also provided in the staff memo.

Meredith Milet (CDPH) then presented to the Council on tools for identifying climate vulnerable communities. This presentation walked through the differences between CalEnviroScreen 3.0, the

Health Disadvantage Index, and the transition of the Health Disadvantage Index to the Healthy Places Index.

- CDPH has developed Climate Change and Health Vulnerability Indicators for California (from CalBRACE)
  - Defined by 3 domains: exposure, sensitivity and capacity
  - 19 indicators between the three categories.
- They are working with the Public Health Alliance of Southern California to incorporating these indicators into the Healthy Places Index.
- HDI focused more on social determinants while CES is focused on environmental influences on health
- HDI is arguably more connected to climate vulnerability

## **COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

Jonathan Parfrey: How much overlap is there between the two tools? Do they rank into the percentiles in the same way?

Meredith Milet: Yes, they both rank in percentiles. The HDI mapping tool shows both HDI and CES scores on the screen. They have also published a document that compares the two tools.

Kit Batten: CES focused on urban environments due to the nature of the tool. Does HDI cover rural areas?

Meredith Milet: A lot of communities in the HDI are rural communities.

Louise Bedsworth: We should start the conversation on next steps for metrics and actions. Do we think we should be tracking all three of the categories? Are those the three categories we should be using? We already talked a lot about the need for government actions and metrics.

Kit Batten: Clarifying question: Are we talking about measuring vulnerability to each of the specific impacts or measuring resiliency?

Louise Bedsworth: I understood it as tracking impacts itself like the California Climate Change Indicators.

Nuin-Tara Key: That is what the conversation has been but no decision has been made.

Kit Batten: I think we should talk more about what we mean by the impacts and potentially bring in more experts. Are we talking about what resilience looks like or what the impact looks like?

Nuin-Tara Key: The group should first decide if developing a new set of impact metrics is a priority for this group, given the other tracking being done on this.

Jana Ganion: I think the impact specific metrics are vitally important and to echo Kit, maybe this group needs more understanding of what metrics are already being tracked. If we were given a summary, then we could drill down into recommendations that we could make for other metrics to be gathered.

Mike Antos: The Water Foundation is doing a sewer water management profile tool similar to LEED standards but for water agencies. The innovative thing they did was measure stress and responses. The tool itself focused on management responses. That seems like the more important part of adaptation that we should track (response over impact). This might be a way to step past whether our measurements are the same.

Bruce: I agree with most of that. I would like to see the report on the California Climate Change Indicators be used more. I'd also like to see us come up with something that measures our losses and what's being done to recover. Maybe we need to actually track the number of plans we have or how many LCPs have been updated to include SLR.

Louise: that captures the government side. An area for us to take on.

Jana Ganion: We could review the list of activities used by FEMA to waive their reimbursement deductibles. This could be looked at as a model for what Bruce was suggesting – activities that measure our resilience in terms of numbers of plans, LCP updates, etc.

Tina Curry: Yes that was a well-researched list of activities.

Grieg: That's a project I work on here at SCAG, and there are other MPOs that have similar tracking projects. We track indicators on the mitigation side. The first step was to count plans and evaluate them. We are going to continue doing that this year but we want to do something more in depth on the adaptation side. We have been operating outside of the ICARP structure, but it could be worthwhile to work with this Council to develop those indicators. Between four of us MPOs doing this work, we cover 80% of the state's population. Most MPOs are already clearinghouses for a lot of data. It would be nice to bring some sort of agreement to the ICARP- what MPOs should be tracking/collecting and how we should be sharing that data.

Brian Strong: That sounds interesting but I'm nervous about tying us to something very complicated. I know how much SF has struggled to decide on the right indicators. Maybe we should be promoting them to locals.

Bruce Riordan: Maybe our role could be to develop 5 or 6 indicators. If we could come up with statewide metrics to represent progress we are making, that could be very impactful.

Kit Batten: the second two categories (vulnerable communities and specific climate impacts) are hard to define and track. Many people have been working on these for years. I would like to avoid having fewer metrics that could be met with speculation. The government action side of things could be a good niche for us. Do we want to facilitate a gap in this area, be a convener? As long as that would be useful.

Nuin-Tara Key: The vulnerable communities piece can definitely be *tied* to government action.

Keali'i Bright: Safeguarding California gives us a first easy step because we list the different planning efforts.

Grieg Asher: I would also like to link this to the earlier conversation about SB 1 funding. We give grants to locals to do climate action plans etc. As we are looking at adaptation funding, we wonder how we can

best help cities apply for that and what they should be doing with that funding. Talking about these metrics could help us identify where cities are and then connect them with the available funding.

Louise Bedsworth: One recommendation I have would be that between now and December we tackle the government category and try to work on those in a workgroup.

Nuin-Tara Key: Defining vulnerable communities will also be a part of the workgroup's next steps (per the vote on the vision and principles).

Louise Bedsworth: Maybe this is also something we should work with CDPH Office of Health Equity as a part of the clearinghouse to compare what kind of tools there are.

Kit Batten: I think that is a good plan. Another element from the government category is what Mike brought up – exploring the process indicators as well. From experience at the federal government, those metrics can be helpful when trying to move the ball forward.

Kit Batten: I move that we establish a work group that will address how this Council might best provide guidance moving forward on government metrics around resilience including process outcomes and how they would link up with vulnerability communities as well.

Bruce Riordan seconded

All: Aye

#### 9. General Public Comment – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

#### 10. Meeting Adjourned